

REMARKS

Claims 2-9, 11-14, 16-23 are pending. Claims 1-9, 11, 13, 15-17 and 19-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Czerwinski. Claims 10, 12, 18 and 21 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 14, 22 and 23 were allowed.

Applicants have amended claims 2-9, 11-13, 19-21, and 23 and canceled claims 1, 10, 15, and 18 consistent with the suggestions set forth by the Examiner. In light of these amendments, Applicants maintain that the rejections are moot and that each of the pending claims now incorporates subject matter recognized as allowable. While Applicants disagree with the rejections made by the Examiner, Applicants have amended the claims to expedite prosecution.

The Examiner rejected claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, stating that the use of the word “approximately” renders the claim indefinite. Applicants disagree but have removed the word “approximately” to expedite prosecution. Support for this amendment can be found in paragraph 35 of the specification.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are allowable over the cited art of record and request that the Examiner allow this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully Submitted,
NINIANE WANG

Date: February 14, 2007

By: /Brenda M. Simon/

Brenda M. Simon, Attorney of Record
Registration No. 48,449
FENWICK & WEST LLP
801 California Street
Mountain View, CA 94041
Phone: (650) 335-7198
Fax: (650) 938-5200
E-Mail: bsimon@fenwick.com